

The Republican.

No. 3, Vol. 8.] LONDON, Friday, July 25, 1823. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF ALBION.

CITIZENS,

Dorchester Gaol, July 18, Year 4,
of the Spanish Revolution.

So complete is the uncertainty of the real state of things in Spain, up to this date, that, I have nothing new to offer on that head, and can only treat upon the subject in general topics. The King and Cortes are still in Cadiz, surrounded by a French army on one side, and a French fleet on the other; and here we must wait the progress of events. To me it seems, that, if the Spaniards can struggle through August, their triumph is certain. - The French Soldiers will lose and the Spanish Constitutionals will gain confidence sufficient to turn the scale. Out of Catalonia, separate from Mina and his heroic companions, nothing like energy has been found in Spain. It is evident, that, the Spaniards do not know enough of the principles of liberty to derive any moral power from such a knowledge. "Common Sense," "Rights of Man," and "Age of Reason" have not yet been translated into the Spanish language; and our Anglo-Spanish Committee would not do amiss, to send out a Spanish copy of each to every man, in whose hands they put a musket. They will then learn what they are about to fight for, as well as to fight: and a knowledge of what they fight for is as essential as the disposition to fight. The one is the moral power, essential to energize the other, which is the physical power. Physical power is a principle very apt to evaporate; and moral power is the only principle that can prevent that evaporation. The latter is the stamina of the former, and turns its whole force to an augmentation of the amount of morality among mankind: and human improvement requires that the one should be always supported by the other.

Buonaparte trusted every thing to physical power and nothing to moral power. His physical power evaporated and

left him as weak as the weakest of those over whom he had tyrannized, and to be tyrannized over in his turn: whilst, if he had given energy to the people whom he conquered and ruled, by communicating to them the most rapid means of improvement; and teaching them how to form a government upon the principles of delegation, where every man in power should hold that power in trust and be answerable for it at a periodical election, he would have been living to this day—THE FIRST OF MANKIND. As it is at present, taking a general view of his career, considering the circumstances that surrounded him when he began to acquire power, he has lived without doing an atom of good; but has done much positive evil, with respect to the improvement of the condition of the people of Europe.

He contemned moral power: he restored a villainous priesthood to aid him in governing by deception and tyranny: he fell as he deserved to fall; and his name will be lisped with execration by future ages, as one of the tyrants, the robbers, and the destroyers of mankind!

In the way of improvement, we shall progress better under the Holy Alliance, than if Buonaparte had continued the master of the continent of Europe. Those, who have a gleam of light on their minds, will not be deceived by the projects of these allied despots; and whilst the superiority of physical power remains on their side, a moral power of rapid growth will rise, spread among the people, and eventually scatter to the winds all the powers which these despots may accumulate. Buonaparte kept up an illusion on the minds of the people, more immoral and more disastrous than the illusions of priestcraft: for, he not only sacrificed the property, but the very heart's blood of industry, and treated mankind as if they had been all generated as an animal food to satiate his appetite for destruction.

I subjoin to this article, an excellent little pamphlet written and printed in America, in 1806, by John Stewart, the celebrated Materialist and Traveller; and addressed to Buonaparte. This pamphlet will explain what I here mean by moral power; and the end of Buonaparte will explain how he fell from the want of that moral power which Stewart recommended to him to acquire.

The stile of Stewart is unfortunately cabalistical: like Major Cartwright, he could not see that the means to obtain his ends was to address himself to the mass of labouring people; but he always wrote for Emperors, Kings, and Aristocrats, who treated him with that contempt which he de-

served in so addressing them! I never think of these robed and feathered animals, unless it be when a vein of ridicule runs through my frame: and then only to express that contempt which I feel for them. I see clearly, that, to correct the evils which they introduce among mankind, it is a necessary first principle to enlighten that mankind: all other principles combined are ineffectual to that end.

As all moral power relates to physical power, it may be necessary here to explain, what is that kind of physical power which does not relate to moral power. It is only by going to first principles that we can reason rightly upon any subject, and it is important that all mankind should understand how and why there are but two first principles that affect their condition—or a moral and an immoral power. When they understand this matter, and reason analytically and synthetically upon those principles, they will be sure to keep on solid ground. If they deviate or lose sight of those first principles, they may wander in the verbose mazes of sophistry and delusion without ever acquiring an atom of useful knowledge.

All power is physical power; but that power divides itself into a moral and an immoral power. Where a man, or a few men, have the power and act upon it, to sacrifice the interest of the many to the individual interest or the interest of the few, that is an immoral physical power: where the same degree of power exists, and is applied to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number, that is a moral physical power. In the whole of human action, you may trace the one or the other of those powers: and it is only by building on this solid ground that a correct, a uniform, and a beautiful system of ethics can be raised.

Buonaparte was one who thought that men and arms were every thing necessary to his purpose: the interest of the mass of mankind was a thing that never entered his head. Military power over the greatest number was his first and last principle; and by a close application of his means to that end he succeeded for a time. By confining himself to this view, he lost the affections of all those with whom he could not share this military power, and raised up against himself a physical power of resistance that was morally applied when compared with his own. This power of resistance advanced to a superiority; and here, in a moment, the tyrant felt himself powerless—a fearful, trembling, abject creature! No moral man regretted his fall. This he knew, and in his adversity he had not one gleam of comfort in re-

flecting on the past: whilst disappointment, the contempt of others, and self contempt with respect to past and present condition brought on that hypochondriac affection which generated premature death. The end of all the present allied despots will be the same; unless they drop off by natural death.

Spain, from the power of priestcraft over her inhabitants, and the consequent ignorance and divisions which distract them, is deficient both in the moral and the physical power which is essential to her present speedy deliverance. As far as she can resist the invasion of those who wish to rivet her chains, she applies a moral power: but it is evident, that, if the Duke of Angouleme or Buonaparte had avowed his intention of freeing the people of Spain from the power of the priests, they would have resisted, from their ignorance, in a manner very different to their present resistance!

It is under these views, that I wish to lay the foundation of a moral power in this Island, that shall display itself to some purpose when the moment arrives that will enable us to break the last link of our chains. In the past, we should only look for lessons how to avoid evil; and we now have those lessons held up to our view in the most prominent form. Let us profit by them: let us sedulously endeavour to undermine all the immoral powers that surround us, whether they belong to our own habits as individuals or as a people; or whether they are imposed upon us from the bad motives of others.

I, therefore, recommend a careful perusal of the following pamphlet: and though it has much that is now extraneous and even ridiculous, it contains much that is really valuable for all men to understand. Momentous times have passed, are passing, and are still at hand. Energy and ability have arisen, are arising, and will arise suited to such times: but it is a matter of pre-eminent importance, that pre-eminent knowledge should be prepared and pre-exist with those times. I leave nothing to providence, nothing to chance, nothing to fortuitous events: the whole duty of man is to prepare himself for what is likely to befall him, whether casual or certain.

Let energy be ready as soon as ever energy is wanted: let knowledge be ready as soon as ever knowledge is wanted: let us do as the sailors do, clear all our decks for action before the action really begins. This we can only do by acquiring knowledge; by removing all our bad habits; by removing gradually, or as fast as possible, all immoral controul,

whether practised by ourselves or by others: by rooting out all false notions and false imaginations: by undermining the powers of the joint tyranny under which we languish—the power of priestcraft and the power kingcraft: that is, of all absolute and undelegated power.

All talk about liberty and freedom, that has not this foundation, or that does not operate upon this principle, ends in delusion, or in adding evil to evil. All talk about a Constitution that does not lay the basis of intelligence and moral legislation, is constitutionally wrong.

RICHARD CARLILE

THE CONQUEST OF THE MORAL WORLD,

PRESENTED TO THE CONQUEROR OF THE PHYSICAL WORLD,
NAPOLEON, EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH.

BY JOHN STEWART.

THE true philosopher approaches the prince as the sun approaches him in the morning's dawn, not to sooth or flatter, but to awaken, to illuminate, and to energize his powers.

You, Sire, possess a higher capacity of physical power than any potentate that ever appeared upon the face of the earth. The conquerors of past ages extended their enormous empires over an immense territory and countless population of savage nations, while your stupendous empire has already concentrated the greatest part, and menaces inevitably to overthrow all the most polished and enlightened nations of the whole civilized world.

This approaching awful catastrophe of civilized institutions overwhelmed by simple military force, whose only law is expediency, would consternate the reflective mind of the philosopher, if it was not soothed by the hopes that the present unbounded liberty of philosophical speculation (the only radical remedy of human ignorance and misery its consequence (patronized by the unparalleled power of your majesty will be wholly and instantaneously employed to illuminate mankind in the present tremendous revolution and confusion of moral sentiments and opinions, which like the critical operation of couching the eye may require for the occasion the strict ligature of force to prevent the convul-

sive struggles of discord in factious and inflammatory politics defeating its success.

In this awful crisis of human destiny, I present, most occasionally and auspiciously to your Majesty, as the highest physical energy that ever appeared among the sovereigns of the world, the highest moral energy in a work called the *OPUS MAXIMUM*, that by combining these two powers in your own sacred person, you may form your own real and rational apotheosis, and become the consummate energy of the human system, or *all accomplished man*: which means divinity, or the highest energy, in every genius of power, that constitutes the universal mechanism of nature; competent, efficient and independent in the human system, to augment good and diminish evil throughout all modes of sensitive life, the great end of human existence.

The *Opus Maximum*, or Conquest of the Moral World, now presented to your Majesty, is the work of an author who has no fabulous pretensions of mysterious supernatural relation to a personified universe, as prophet, messenger, or kindred relative.—He is a traveller, who has visited all nations of the globe, to study man, in his relations to nature, not mountains, rivers, plants and animals, whose head and whose heart, energizing through the new and multiplied evidence of such extensive travels, generating new perceptions, and new objects of comparison, to improve reason into just discipline, governed by the laws of intellectual power, that is, a mind emancipated from all the prejudices of education, country, and custom; and a heart expanded by such a well disciplined and calculative reason, beyond the narrow and brutal limits of instinct, or towards the just and improvable relations of perfectable manhood, generating those unbounded sensations of sympathy, which makes the whole system of sensitive life the integer of constituent self, whose organism, or powers, like that of the torrent, are increased by the united efforts of its globules, and not by factitious and divided relations of instinct, in kindred property and community, constructed by civic artifice, to oppose the organism of natural society, which multiplies powers in the union, and not division of effort.

In Nature's life, man like a torrent lives,
Each drop gains force, a million what it gives,
Where reason calculates beyond instinct's plan,
And all relations lost in that of *Man* :
Religion there no vengeful god appears,
But common good, which man to man endears.

Such an improved state of mind, in thought and action, makes the author of the *OPUS MAXIMUM*, or, *Scripture of Reason*, the first man that ever lived, in the true category of manhood; and worthy the patronage of the first of potentates, and first of the conquerors.

The *Opus Maximum*, or, *Conquest of the Moral World*, the characteristic penetration of your Majesty will discover to be the only true *Scripture of Reason*; [which means a just transcript of the laws of nature, as exhibited in the intelligible phenomena of the universe] that has ever appeared to determine the true principles and distinct practical means of the moral and physical sciences, as related to human existence.

The pretended *Scripture or Revelations*, of the Chinese, the Peruvians, the Tartars, the Persians, the Indians, the Egyptians, and the Europeans, are nothing but an incongruous mass of mysteries and fables, which transcribe nothing from the volume of things and relations, in the phenomena of the visible universe. They exhibit no moral principles, but only practical rules and means of changeable customs, as justice, property, faith and power, which the improveable progress of society may abrogate, in theory and practice, as in the republic of Plato, and the improveable state of many existing fraternities, sects and communities.

The *Opus Maximum*, the *Scripture of Reason*, and *Conquest of the Moral World*, reveals or transcribes from the constitution of nature, immutable principles of moral and physical truths, [not means and rules, discoverable only by experience] viz. That all being is united in time and futurity, in one common interest, demonstrated through the perpetual circulation of matter, from mode to mode, both in life and death, passing from a point of agency, in the personal identity, to a vast circle of patiency in the material identity.

That the primary element, or principle of all human society, is to co-operate with united energy, or universal organism of the whole species, to secure individual liberty, by placing it under the protection of the public will, or majority of a community, in small societies, and not to leave the individual subjugated and tormented by the capricious relations of custom or instinct, as, in the present imperfect state of society, began, formed and completed, without any alteration by Scythian barbarism.

The means and rules to execute the unalterable principles of theory, and accommodate them to practical perfectability,

are wholly empyric, and cannot be revealed by any dicta tes of codes or theories, but must be accommodated by civil power, to the improving state of intellect, and expanding sympathy of the subjected population, advanced, through a proper system of education and instruction, as developed in the Opus Maximum, under the lucid figure of the spiral diagram, whose double centre of base and vertex, forms, the true and double criterion of moral truth : viz. perfectability led on by the clue of experience.

The great object and sole purpose of this philosophic address, is to impress with awe, upon your Majesty's mind, in a few succinct observations and explanations, the most momentous revelation contained in the Opus Maximum, and which alone constitutes the Conquest of the Moral World, viz. That the indestructible atoms of matter are incessantly circulating from body to body, throughout all modes of sensitive life, and in the transition they pass from a single point, or centre of agency, in the personal identity, into a vast circle of multiplied patiency, the material identity ; which causes the retribution of the agency of good or evil to be increased in an incalculable ratio, to all atoms of matter that exist or circulate in the patiency or sphere of sensitive life.

I will demonstrate, with complete evidence, the truth of this most important revelation, in the conduct of your Majesty's own personal agency, under the double identity of person and matter.

When, Sire, you form a decree, issue an order, or perform an action, to execute some particular desire, or gratify some urgent inclination, you enjoy the pleasure of that action in your single and personal identity of Emperor ; but this decree, order or action, may diffuse pain or pleasure to millions of millions of subjects, allies and surrounding nations ; and as your personal atoms are every moment leaving your body, and dispersing themselves far beyond the extent of your own empire, they must in their vast sphere of circulation, successively become constituent parts of millions of millions of sensitive beings, affected in their actual condition of enjoyment or sufferance, by their own previous agency in their collective or personal identity in the body of Emperor, and, consequently, must multiply their interest of pain and pleasure, in an incalculable ratio, in the vast circle of patiency, in their new material identities, which cannot be affected by the loss of memory,

in the change of consciousness, by the transmutation of their substance, from mode to mode.

It has been objected to this clear and demonstrable chemical process of nature in its laws of circulation of matter, throughout all bodies within the vast sphere of influence or affinity, that as the personal identity must lose all remembrance of its connection with the material identity, that is, that the atoms of the prince, when separated, and circulating into the bodies of subjects, that they lose all proper interest, in the loss of memory, or change of consciousness.

This objection is extremely futile and irreflective, as the following arguments will shew. If the atoms of the prince, in their previous agency, or collective consciousness of a personal identity, have communicated, or been the cause of good or evil to their successive material patiency, in new consciousness of new identities, though these atoms must lose all memory of their previous associations in past identity, and assume or change it into the consciousness of a new identity, such oblivion or change of personal identity, cannot alter or affect the nature of the really existent sensations, suffered or enjoyed by the same identical atoms.

I will suppose a traveller on horseback, during the day to have interchanged many millions of atoms with the body of his horse—Now I demand, whether those human atoms that have transmuted into the new identity of horse, will feel less pain from the spur, the bit, the whip, the galling, the mutilating, jading and the hunger, inflicted by the agency of their previous identity, man, because they have lost all consciousness of their former association in such identity, and acquired the new one of horse?

This important revelation of human interest, in the transmutation of matter, I shall make another effort to demonstrate, in answering a very general objection to its truth, which is, that when a limb or member is amputated from any part of the body, all personal interest in that detached member must cease.

We must take notice, that the human body forms two clear and discriminate identities, the one merely nominal, called personal identity, and the other real, called material identity; which have no proper, or common, but only an influential interest with each other, which may be explained in the following manner.

The nominal, or personal identity called self, is nothing but a succession of thoughts or sensations, bound together by

the tether of memory; and when this ends, the identity ceases. The agency of this personal identity tends only to procure a continuation of good, to what is called self, or person, and to perpetuate and expand that good, in the widest circle of the sensitive system; to anticipate the interests or procure the well-being of the real or material identity, in the transmutation and circulation of its indestructible atoms into that sphere in which all connection with the identity of self or person is totally lost.

The amputated limb has certainly no connection whatever with the proper interest of the nominal identity it left, but the matter thereof, diffusing itself into the general circulation of the whole sensitive system, will meet in an infinitely multiplied ratio, a proportion of good or evil that its previous agency, while a constituent part of the human body, might have augmented or diminished in its future state of patency.

Hence we may observe, with the completest evidence, that though there exists no unity of interest between the two identities, personal and material, in their separation, but only in influence, while combined, the personal identity possessing the whole agency is obliged, by the laws of sympathy in the moral world, to provide good for its own succession of thoughts or sensation, and to extend that good to the interests of the material identity, in the transmutation of its indestructible atoms, throughout the great circle of patency, in the whole sensitive system.

I have clearly proved, in my exposition and discovery of the laws of intellectual power, that all human action must be guided and governed by the observation of facts, and the criterion of experience, to ascertain their relations in science or knowledge. Now, as the fact of the transmutation of matter from body to body, is ascertained by the sense of smelling, and the contagion of diseases. This fact, founded on experience, forms a positive law of sensation, or thought, which directs man to extend the sphere of his agency, from the interest of the personal, to that of the material identity, in the circulation or transmutation of its individual atoms, throughout the whole sensitive system; and whatever conjectures may be formed, on rational analogy, relative to the quantity or duration of such interest, as these can never be brought to the test of experience, they can have no influence on human action, or the moral conduct of mankind.

It has been objected, Sire, to this system of Materialism, that it is a *gloomy doctrine*: this sentiment is the effect of

bad mental habitudes, unacquainted with the moral and physical laws of the universe.

The man whose thoughts and sensations are disciplined in accord with the harmony of nature's laws, conducts the unbounded operations of the faculty of imagination, in the conjectures of rational analogy, in a close similitude of cause and effect, in the same genera of things, as thus:—

He analogises the chemical affinity and transmutation of terrestrial bodies, with celestial bodies of planets, satellites, comets, suns, and stars, and as the former are in a constant state of intercircularity with each other, and of the same genera of matter and power, it is rational or disciplined analogy that enables the imagination to conclude, from similitude of cause and effect, that all the bodies of the celestial system have the same intercircularity of matter, from one to the other, and produces the following dignifying and consoling conjectures:

That the indestructible atoms of matter, which pass through the body of man, must circulate throughout all the genera and species of matter and power, which constitute the great body of the universe, and instead of being fixed, according to the mysteries of theology, to an eternal identity of person, [the greatest torture that could be inflicted on sensitive matter] every atom in nature must circulate like those of the human body, carrying the particles of the foot into the locality of the brain, and, *vice versa*, throughout the great body or mechanism of the universe, and become, at one time, the central, and at another time the circumferential member of nature; and such conjectures of rational analogy [that have nothing to do with the direction of human action, but only the consolation of thought] elevate degraded man to the highest dignity of his character, the highest felicity of thought and sensation, and the highest energy of his nature, in the true predicament of manhood, that is the conformity of the relations of thought and action, to the relation of things in the constitution of nature.

This demonstration of the unity of interest throughout the sphere of sensitive life reveals an important principle, which is, that the word worship, which in the present chaos of the moral world, means adulation, fear and prostration of one atom for another, in the true laws of the constitution of nature means only the co-operation of the various genera and species of indestructible atoms to augment the sum of good and diminish the sum of evil throughout the whole sensitive existence, in which the previous agency of matter identifies

and multiplies in an incalculable ratio its interest with the patience of all successive modifications of life.

Men, bubbles like, on sea of matter borne,
Rise, break, and to and from the sea return.

This important law of the constitution of nature, as revealed in the *Opus Maximum*, or *Scripture of Reason and Nature*, proves it to be the interest of all human matter to tranquillize the immense ocean of sensitive existence, into which it must incessantly break and circulate, and consequently suffer all the agitation and enjoy all the calm in an incalculable ratio of interest in the unbounded influence of agency over patience, independent of the connection of reminiscence and the oblivion of past combinations.

I conjure your Majesty, in the sacred name of universal nature, of which man is a co-equal, co-essential, and co-eternal part, to command your own institutes, and recommend to all other academies of the civilized world, to suspend their trifling pursuits and studies of literature, and examine, with exclusive and profound attention, this momentous revelation of matter in its unity of interest, essence and power.

No high, no low, first, last, no great, no small,
One Nature forms, unites and equals all.

This transcendent fact, if found true in science, cannot fail to develop the true elements of the moral science, to date the first moment of perfectable life, and form the only dignified and beneficent æra of human existence, and to produce such a revolution in the moral world, that must eternize both the fame and the interest of your Majesty's sacred person, far beyond the efforts of physical power, in arms, victory or conquest; these, if unaccompanied with moral energies, do but gibbet the infamy of heroic folly, through a short period of babbling history; and then break and disperse like waves on the shore, leaving the transmuted atoms of the hero to agonize as patients of their own previous energy, in the diffusion of human misery to an incalculable period of duration, and sphere of extension; while pompous monument, statues, poems, and histories will sing but a vain and empty lullaby of glory to his suffering atoms, in their vast circle of patience, diffused throughout the whole system of sensitive life.

The duration of your Majesty's power and dignity can be supported only by an alliance with philosophy. Superstition, prejudice, and habitudes will conspire against them

in secret hostility, through many generations, and this idea will suggest the indispensable necessity of educating your royal successors in the principles of the *Opus Maximum*, and promoting the immediate and most extensive circulation of its doctrines and revelations, over all the world.

I have observed, Sire, among the various nations of the globe, that the forms or reforms of government, together with those of moral opinions, from despotism to democracy, from deism to dogism, from dissipation and levity to austerity of morals, had done, and could do nothing to meliorate the social condition of man, and that all perfectability, the high and sole characteristic of the human species, must originate in the discovery of the laws of nature in the moral world, and the establishment thereon of the discipline of the human understanding; to make it an instrument of sense, to form ideas of its own, and not a sack of science, to be stuffed full with those of other men, which gives to the mind the temperament of a dial, losing all its rectitude in the change of latitude, in customs, laws, and habitudes; whereas sense gives to the mind the temperament of the compass, to oscillate, through genius and invention, in the incessant mutability of moral circumstances, the variations of theory and practice. The appositeness of this simile has been lamentably verified in the French revolution; where the sages of science, and not sense, being called to legislate, mistook the remote theories of perfectability for the accommodative and proximate means of practice.

The human understanding being cramped and distorted by the schools of lettered education, instead of the instruction of ideas, mankind have no more use of their mental faculties, to advance in the road to perfectability, than the Chinese women, whose feet have been cramped and deformed in an iron shoe, can use their legs without stumbling or falling.

The discipline of the understanding, and discovery of the laws of intellect, effected by the *Opus Maximum*, now meets the human mind, in the very auspicious moment that it has awakened from the dreams of theological and metaphysical fancy, and at the more critical instant, when philosophy has discovered and demonstrated, upon the most rational evidence of analogy, that the great mechanism of the universe is constituted of a vast series of powers, of different genera and species, of which intellect is but a very low and very inferior member; and thus the pivot of the moral world,

which has turned for ages on religion, or a personified will of nature is broken and lost for ever.

In this unparalleled and awful crisis, the moral world, like a ship, driven from its mooring of ignorance, superstition and feudal tyranny, is now tossing to and fro, *without course and steerage*, on the tempestuous ocean of moral discord, and demands, instantaneously, an intellectual compass, constructed on the laws of moral science, and the true discipline of reason, to direct its course.

This compass is invented and developed in the Opus Maximum, and you, Sire, by giving it protection and publicity, indispensable to the support of your own empire, may become the first pilot of the vessel of humanity, and the real saviour of the world, as the great integer of self, and thus to live *the great, the good, the wise Napoleon*, and not only in history, but in the memory of all mankind, or what is infinitely more important, to improve in an incalculable ratio, the future interests and sensations of your own indestructible atoms, circulating throughout the whole sensitive system, till the whole genus of animal life may be extinct, or the globe itself be dissolved.

The progress and means of human perfectability, in the present state of defective reason, in the total ignorance of human nature, in its relations to self, species, and the universe, must be conducted through education and instruction.

School education, which now teaches the developement of memory alone, in the repetition of words, which carry in themselves no intelligent ends or means, to the infantine mind, as noun, pronoun, participle, should be supplanted by intelligent intellectual games, so invented, that their ends and means might be clearly understood, which would dispose the youthful mind to exercise the faculties of judgment, reflection, and reason, to combine them in execution with sense and sagacity. These games should be connected with bodily exercise, that the developement of both the moral and physical powers should accompany each other, and form the true definition of education; *mens sana in corpore sano*—a sound mind in a sound body.

Instruction should be conducted through the medium of chemistry, to make man acquainted with the laws of nature, relative to his own self-being, and his relations to the universe; acquiring with such instruction, the true predicament of manhood. These perfectable beings might form small

societies of natural life, opposed to civil life, where the relation of man, absorbing all factitious relations of kindred, property and community, the majority of numbers should form the governing will to protect the individual from individual tyranny, and thereby augment his pleasures, his liberty, his safety, and his power, following the code of moral nature, *think; speak all you think; violate not the inoffensive will of any sensitive being.* These societies should detach themselves in colonies, and receive the aid and protection of the mother country, till their numbers would enable them to protect themselves, and send forth their missions to every part of the globe, to teach the discipline of intellectual power, as the only means of well-being or human perfectability, demonstrated by their own infallible example.

ORGANIZATION—INTELLECT.

THE following extract, quotation, and comment is printed for the purpose of shewing how very differently enquiring men think and reason on some most important subjects, and also in the hope that others will give their best attention to the question discussed: it being impossible for any one to think closely on the matter without benefit to himself and others.

A friend in London occasionally looks over the proof sheets of "The Republican;" in No. 24, Vol. VII. published on the 13th of June last, at the conclusion of my letter to Mr. Affleck, page 762 was the following passage:

"A hypocrite is certainly the most detestable of the species; and whether he be a religious, or an Atheistical, hypocrite makes no difference. I know many Atheistical hypocrites and I detest them. Among those who profess to give an open support to my principles, I find some eminently faithful, and I find others who will rob me to whatever extent they can. I can only account for this, by saying, that some men are *naturally* base, and others are *naturally* moral; and I conclude, that equal laws and equal power is essential to strengthen the morality of the one, and to restrain the baseness of the other."

My friend altered the last member of the sentence and made it read thus:—

"I can only account for this, by saying, that some men are, from bad education, base, and others, from better education, moral;

and I conclude, that equal laws and equal power is essential to strengthen the morality of the one, and to restrain the baseness of the other."

It occurred to me that my friend had mistaken my meaning, and as I could not concur with him in the sentiment he had made me utter I wrote to him on the subject, and he replied as follows:—

London, June 18, 1823.

You observe, that I altered the last sentence of your letter to Mr. Affleck, to an opposite sense to other parts of the letter, I did not intend to do so, I altered it because it seemed to me to have no sense at all. I hesitated, not liking to change the words, but as the words conveyed no idea, I ventured to make the alteration. You say the drift of "the letter was to shew that man had passions which no education could controul," and I made you say, that they were the result of education. You say, "I concluded that equal laws were the only thing sufficient to restrain the bad passions, as education was not sufficient; you make me say, that good education is sufficient."

If I did this, I made you repeat a truism. You add, "I fancy that I see the passions of mankind differing under all circumstances with their different organizations." I will remark on this last "fancy" first, and shew you I hope that it is nothing but a "fancy." You see passions at work as per the organization, that is, you infer the organization from your observation of the practice, now this is a gratuitous conclusion, without premises. What do you, or I, or any one, know of the actual organization which you conclude to be necessary to stir one passion, or set of passions, in preference to another passion, or set of passions; surely you know nothing about it, pray examine the subject again and get a clear idea of it, of your own want of knowledge if you can; the one will be as useful as the other, although it is much easier for every one of us to deceive, than to detect himself. What you see is this, that men are operated upon by circumstances, and what you also see is, that the same circumstances can never be exactly alike to any two men, and consequently never can impress them exactly alike, and you refer the difference that results to organization, which is accounting for the difference by an occult cause; by having more or less of the Holy Ghost to spare for one than for another.

Now for *education*, you seem to confine the meaning of the word to school-teaching, or if you go beyond that, you stop at that sort of discipline called precept. I never use the word in either of these senses, and it would be well if every man understood it as including all the means by which he obtains knowledge.

The mother nursing and feeding the infant is teaching, school learning is teaching, playing at games is teaching, every thing around us is teaching, although some do not take the trouble

to collect as much as others. The whole of this teaching is education. You will see at once, that in this is included the operation of laws and the customs of society. Man is essentially the creature of circumstances, this you seem to admit; but you say men are differently affected, this must be admitted; but you account for it by making the difference to accord with some fanciful arrangement (organization) as some part of each is supposed to differ. It is intellect which forms the base of our argument, and this according to you must be more or less as the organization is more or less perfect, so that a perfectly well organized man *must* necessarily be a Solomon, let him be born wherever he may. This inference is, I think, unavoidable; but this is contrary to experience. In New Holland the people had in many hundreds of years made no progress at all in intellectual attainment. It is impossible to conceive how even the very small number of people in New Holland could have lived at all with even a shade of knowledge less than they possessed, and the conclusion we are driven to is, that they must have been as intellectual many hundreds of years ago, perhaps many thousands of years ago, as they were when we made the settlement among them. Now how did it happen that these people were so equally organized that no one ever made a discovery; an improvement. The truth is, I suspect this, that circumstances did not occur to teach them, did not occur to produce the intellect necessary for improvement; the soil was there, but the seed was wanting, and the culture was wanting. I am of opinion, that intellect is as much a result of certain modes of manufacturing as any piece of machinery is. A man is brought up (let us suppose) a Welsh shepherd, spends his boyhood and his manhood in lounging about, and is as stupid as any one of his flock; now suppose this shepherd to have been placed when young under the care of persons well qualified, and very desirous to make him a correct reasoner on every useful and important subject, would he be the same man? You will say no, certainly not; but, you will add, take two such boys and do your best with them and there will still be a material difference between them, and this difference will be as the difference of their organizations. Try this notion of yours another way, thus, after all possible pains have been taken, the two boys will have received a very different education, different impulses will have been given to them, and many of these too from causes not noticed, or unknown to their preceptors and even to themselves, each may therefore be as wise as his fellow and yet their modes of shewing their wisdom may be very different, or they may differ considerably in the quantity of wisdom each may possess; and this would be the case if the two boys were organized exactly alike, or if the same boy were placed under the one or the other set of circumstances. Take an example; one boy stays at home and his attention is drawn towards a clock, he examines it, becomes strongly excited, and all his other studies are neglected in some degree in consequence of the thirst of knowledge which the machinery of the clock has excited. This circumstance might, and probably would,

influence his whole future life. Now suppose that the other boy went out, or suppose the former boy did not remain at home but went out, in either case the circumstances respecting the clock could not have occurred at that time, and might never have occurred at any time, and thus this piece of education would not have operated, but other circumstances might have occurred to give a very different direction to the boy, and might cause his intellectual powers to be of a higher or of a lower order, just as he happened to be influenced by those circumstances. In either case, if a powerful stimulus was given, although the direction were as opposite as it is possible to imagine, the consequence might be a much lower intellectual power than the preceptors had calculated upon as probable, or it might be the means of stimulating the pupil in the way they wished and produce a higher intellectual power than they had calculated upon, and yet they might be wholly ignorant of the cause, and consequently unable to controul the pupil in respect to it. But would it not be absurd to say that the cause of the actual difference was to be sought in the imaginary difference of organization, in the one case between the two boys, in the other case in the same boy.

The best conclusion that I have been able to come to, after much observation, is, that by a judicious adaptation of such means as the child may require for the purpose, a pretty equal quantity of intellect may be produced in all those children whose physical difference does not amount to deformity; and that deformity, such as to make the child a defective animal, and I am of opinion, that ninety-nine out of every hundred are capable of intellectual culture to a pretty equal extent.

This subject might be elucidated in many ways, and numberless examples might be adduced, but it is perhaps best to treat of it generally, and to invite every one to reason on the matter for himself.

Those who are of my opinion will be found to be by far the most likely to improve mankind, for having no occult cause to serve them as an excuse for idleness or ignorance, they are the least likely to give up any case as hopeless, and by far the most likely to succeed to a much greater extent than those, who avail themselves of the excuse organization furnishes to neglect their duty. If the preceptor were *profoundly* wise himself, it could hardly fail, that he should be able to give such clear demonstrations as should command the assent of his pupil. If he taught him to reason correctly, and to take care to have all the circumstances of the case before him, or present to him, it would be impossible for the pupil to come to a wrong conclusion, and it is impossible to shew that the generality of mankind if so instructed would not be capable of understanding the reasonings and drawing the same conclusions. But inasmuch as preceptors are deficient and careless, so in proportion must be the intellectual powers of those they teach or neglect, and so must also be the quantity of folly or wisdom in all its different shades and gradations among mankind."

The only reply that can be given to the foregoing extract is to point the fact; that there is an actual difference in the temperament of all kinds of animals, arising from their variance in organization, state of health, and other physical conditions and relations: which, though education may controul to a great extent, can never equalize in similitude. It is upon a confined scale, what the difference between different species of animals is upon a larger scale, and if we contend that education is all the difference, we may as safely say, that education would make the lion a lamb, or the sheep a goat. I also use the word *education* in the larger sense, or as embracing whatever instruction or discipline a man subjects himself to or is subjected to by others, throughout his life. Education is wholly a *moral power*: I speak of *physical power*. And I can only admit the correctness of my friends argument as applicable to the matter in question, when I am taught, that there is no difference nor distinction in moral and physical power. Nor can I admit that to be an occult quality which is so prominent and visible, not only in every species of animal; but, in all the animals of the same species. I am of opinion, that we shall never reason rightly about man, until we view him in comparison and conjunction with other animals, or as a part of the animated whole.

RICHARD CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, July 1, 1823.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HAMPSHIRE COUNTY
NEWSPAPER.

SIR

Dorchester Gaol, June 21, 1823.

As my name has lately found its way into your paper; first in the form of a challenge to the clergy, to meet and refute my opinions, instead of persecuting the publishers, and again, in the shape of an answer to that challenge; I feel myself called upon to notice the last communication.

The writer, under the signature of "A Lover of Truth," says: "There is not an argument that has ever been opposed to it (Christianity) that has not been answered, and folios upon folios now lie which infidelity dares not touch, and from the examination of which it shrinks with an invincible fear."

As far as this assertion applies to me it is not "Veritas." I have anxiously sought after every thing that can be considered an evidence in favour of Christianity; and, though it is possible, that many works written in defence of that religion have been beyond my reach, I feel so far convinced, that I have met with all the essential arguments, that I call upon your correspondent to point my attention to one that I fear to encounter.

In most controversies on a large scale, it is a misfortune, that people will content themselves with ranging on one side, and with reading the arguments of that side alone. This is a common evil; and, in this particular case, applies to the unbeliever as well as to the believer of the validity of Christianity. In a question affecting the interests of all mankind so extensively, as is the soundness or unsoundness of Christianity, it becomes criminal to restrain the discussion, or to be content with looking at only one side of it: and, fancying that "A Lover of Truth" is a teacher of Christianity, I beg leave to ask him, whether the following questions or objections can be cleared up.

First: What evidence, out of the New Testament, can be found, that the name of Jesus Christ, or the sect of Christians, was known in Jerusalem, before the destruction of that city by Titus?

Second: What evidence, that any one book, gospel, or epistle, contained in the New Testament was written before that period?

And third: What evidence does the New Testament itself afford of the ascension of Jesus Christ, since those who are stated to have been eye witnesses of that scene: to wit: Matthew, John, Peter, James, and Jude have not left even an allusion to such a circumstance in the writings ascribed to them?

On the ground of personal testimony, this last is the most striking objection that has yet been made to the divinity of the Christian religion, as it is founded entirely upon the contents of the New Testament. The two first questions are purely a matter of history, depending upon corroborative evidence; the third, a matter of narrative resting upon its own internal credibility. If "A Lover of Truth" can refer me to the *folio* which has answered these objections, he may be assured that he will do no small service to the cause of Christianity.

Upon the other point which "A Lover of Truth" touches, I would observe: that all theological disputes are now

nearly brought to one point: whether the Almighty Power (for such a power is not questioned, cannot be *rationaly* questioned) be wholly material, or wholly immaterial; whether it be or be not intelligent. We have been hitherto quarrelling more about *words* than *things*: we never quarrel about colours, or about any thing we can define or understand; but always about words which we cannot define; and which are generally without any physical relations, consequently, beyond our powers to communicate to each other in the shape of ideas.

Those who argue for immateriality and intelligence introduce the apparent evidence of design pervading all matter, as what appears to them, a proof of a Designer, or an intelligent Creator. They say, that, every thing in existence proclaims itself to be the design of the Creator.

The Materialist starts this difficulty: Throughout the animated word, where sensation is alone supposed to exist, there is evidently a pervading mixture of two opposite principles, or those which cause pleasure and pain. In a physical sense, we term these qualities *good* and *evil*: in a moral sense, we use the same terms; but recognize them also under the distinctions of virtue and vice, humanity and inhumanity, morality and immorality, honesty and dishonesty, truth and falsehood, right and wrong. The first, or the last of these designations, expresses the sense of all the others, and the whole may therefore be reduced to the words *good* and *evil*, as they affect the animal sensations and generate pleasure or pain.

To ascribe the creation of these two opposite principles to two opposite powers, is a manifest impeachment of Omnipotence, which cannot be tolerated for a moment; though, the idea is very ancient, as ancient as any kind of existing history. To ascribe them to one power is as manifest an impeachment of the good design of intelligent omnipotence; therefore, the Materialist, rather than attribute evil design to an omnipotent power, surmounts the difficulty by holding, that, beyond the animal powers, intelligence does not exist: as there is not, in fact, a shadow of proof, that it does, or that it can possibly exist, distinct from a nervous organization and its consequent sensations.

The reverse of the proposition, or the tenets of the Immaterialist, can need no further elucidation, than the reflection the contrast conveys.

The inference which I shall draw from this statement of the argument is, that the first and greatest duty of every hu-

man being is, to endeavour to increase the amount of good, of virtue, morality, humanity, honesty and truth; and to lessen the amount of the countervailing principles that produce evil and pain.

I can assure "A Lover of Truth," for my own part, that I have "an invincible fear" of nothing but of wrong doing; and that, the moment he or any other person can shew me, that I have done wrong, I will be found a most sincere penitent: as a Christian if Christianity can be shewn to be founded in truth, or as any other sect or denomination of religionists with which morality and truth shall be shewn most to abound.

The discussions of the ancient Grecian Philosophers were not unlike those of the modern materialists and immaterialists: and to shew the great superiority which the sciences of astronomy and chemistry have afforded the modern materialists, in unfolding a knowledge of the planetary motions and the wonderful powers, properties and changes of fluid upon solid, and solid upon fluid matter, I will transcribe an extract from an early number of the Quarterly Review.

" OPINIONS OF THE GREEKS RELATING TO DEITY.

"What is God? asked the first philosophers.—He is the most ancient of all things; for he is without beginning, said Thales.—He is air, said Anaximenes.—He is a pure mind, said Anaxagoras.—He is air and mind, said Archelaus.—He is mind in a spherical form, said Democritus.—He is a monod, and the principle of good, said Pythagoras.—He is an eternal circular fire, said Heraclitus.—He is the infinite and immoveable principle in a spherical form, said Parmenides.—He is one and every thing, said Melissus and Zeno—the only eternal and infinite.—These were subjects in which the profoundest mind might have discovered the most ample exercise for itself: but to the Greek a vacuity was still left; necessity, fate and fortune, or accident filled it up.

"The universe furnished another set of disputations. What is, has ever been, and the world is eternal, said one party.—The world is not eternal, but matter is eternal, argued another party.—Was this matter susceptible of forms of one or of many?—Was it water, or air, or fire?—Was it an assemblage of atoms, or an infinite number of incorruptible elements?—Had this matter subsisted without movement in chaos, or had it an irregular movement?—Did the world appear by intelligence communicating its action to it; or did

God ordain it, by penetrating it with a part of his essence? Did these atoms move in the void, and was the universe the result of their fortuitous union?—Are there but two elements in nature, earth and fire, and by these are all things formed and produced?—or are there four elements, whose parts are united by love and separated by hatred? Causes and essences; bodies, forms, and colours; production and dissolution; the great phenomena of visible nature; the magnitude of figures, eclipses, and phases of the two heavenly luminaries; the nature and division of the sky; the magnitude and situation of the earth; the sea with its ebbs and flows; the causes of thunder, lightning, winds, and earthquakes:—all these furnished disquisitions, which were pursued with an eagerness of research and intenseness of application peculiar to the Greeks.—Man, a compound of matter and mind, having relations to the universe by the former, and to the eternal being by the latter, presented phenomena and contradictions, as puzzling to the old philosophers, as the universe of which he was the abridgment. While all allowed him a soul and an intelligence, all differed widely in their definition of this soul or intelligence. It is always in motion, and it moves by itself, said one party; it is a number in motion; it is the harmony of the four elements; it is air, it is water, it is fire, it is blood; it is a fiery mixture of things, perceptible by the intellect, which have globes, shapes, and the force of fire; it is a flame which emanates from the sun; it is an assemblage of fiery and spherical atoms, like those subtle particles of matter which are seen agitated in the rays of the sun.

“Such were a few of the speculations which science had devised for employing the thoughts of active minded men in Greece.”

These early philosophers had a distinct idea of the two principles, which are common to and affect the animal sensations; and they saw, that they were necessarily primary subjects for investigation; but, though they were men of strong minds, they discussed and doubted in the dark:—Galileo had not then been persecuted by the Christian Church, for unfolding, with his telescope, a knowledge of the planetary motions; nor had a Priestly, when beginning to unfold the wonderful properties of fluid and of solid matter, fled his country, after having his house and his invaluable laboratory destroyed by an infuriated Christian mob.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

RICHARD CARLILE.

Private Postscript. Should you have scruples to insert this

letter, you will oblige me much by putting it under cover for Mr. Goldsmith of Hambledon; but should you not scruple, I shall esteem it a favour to receive an early paper, and will endeavour to repay the compliment. I have studiously endeavoured to avoid giving an offensive word, which are but too common in those discussions; and I have as studiously sought not to introduce any thing superfluous, or that was not called for: therefore abridgment would affect the spirit of the whole.

THE MORALITY OF ATHEISM CONTRASTED WITH RELIGIOUS MORALITY.

AFTER the expression of so much seeming anxiety for the morals of the human race, should Atheism ever become prevalent; by some well-meaning, although weak-minded individuals, it may not be amiss to shew that there is no ground for this fearful apprehension. Why should the Atheist be immoral more than the Religionist? It is his interest to be moral, as much as it is that of any other man. He has every inducement to be a moral man, without any of the frantic and enthusiastic incentives of religion, to hurry him into immorality. The Atheist is opposed to delusion, to error, to falsehood, only because they are fatal to the interests, fatal to the happiness of society, and at war with the welfare of mankind. The Atheist has a code, by which he conforms himself, founded upon facts, built upon experience; guided by reason. He walks through the Garden of Nature, converting only the wholesome and delicious fruits to his use: experience teaches him to refuse, to cast aside the noxious and poisonous plants. To receive nourishment, to feel pleasure, and to communicate these to others, is the moving principle of the moral Atheist. Thus he becomes serviceable to his fellow creatures, his whole life is taken up, in making those around him happy; that he may enjoy happiness himself; that his acquaintance may feel interested in his welfare, may smile upon his prosperity, may share in his felicity. He fears no revenging and implacable phantom of superstition; he worships no unknown powers; he seeks for no laws out of the world which he inhabits; he asks not for a rule of action from the *arch Priest*, from the *insane devotee*, or, the *morose bigots*, his whole conduct is squared; not by any fanciful theory; not by any chimerical system; but by the duties of morality; these, *unlike* the various *contradictory* chimeras of the religionist remain the same; founded upon *truth* they are *eternal*.

Morality is but another word for virtue, virtue partakes of the happiness it creates; it is a "*substantial good*." Religion is founded upon error, and the ignorance of man. Error is injurious

to the community and of course, a *pestilential evil*, poisoning every thing within its deadly influence.

The history of religion is nothing more or less than a recital of the most barbarous deeds, the most horrid persecutions, the most inhuman carnage! There is no system of religion but tends to shackle the faculties of man, to cramp his noble energies, to deaden his thirst for Knowledge. In order to reconcile the absurdities, which naturally arise out of inconceivable mysteries, which abound in every incomprehensible system, man's imagination is tickled with *fanciful illusions*, his mind is *fettered* with a *chain of destructive chimeras* whose *links* are formed out of *error* and closed by *delusion* on the *anvil of prejudice*. In this state of bondage his mind remains in the keeping of his priests, whose *existence* depends upon his being considered the *agent* of an *avenging deity*.

The person who has the hardihood to break through the trammels of mental error, who has the *courage* to *proclaim* the *falsehood* of these *delusive* and *petrifying* systems, who has the *honesty* to lay bare the glaring impositions of the priest, is exposed to all the horrid, rancorous, and inhuman treatment, that can be inflicted by a bewildered, by a maddened, by a fanatical multitude. *Insanity* *pourtrays* to them an ALMIGHTY DEITY, pleased with THEIR SERVICES, urging the destruction of every thing that fits not with their own blind and cruel passions, which lead them to believe that every *blow*, struck at the heart of naked *truth*, and that the *destroying*, the *mangling*, the *murdering*, of every *human being*, who cannot subscribe to their evil, base, and absurd dogmas; is the most PLEASING DEVOTION they can offer to an INCENSED DEITY.

Such is the morality of Religion! It is an *engine* employed by *tyrants* to *sanctify* the most destructive and baneful wars! It renders *holy* the *massacre* of *thousands*, the *plundering* of *millions*, and after putting down the *rising spirit of freedom*, after conveying *devastation* into a country where *regeneration* and *moral legislation* is in its infancy, it *immolates thousands* upon the *blood-stained altars* of its idol; and the spiritual conscience-keeping monsters, will offer up a *thanksgiving*, will perform a *mass*, will sing a *requiem* to the *departed shades*, of those who have been SACRIFICED by the *hypocrisy*, the *cruelty*, and the *deception*, of THESE DESTROYERS OF THE HUMAN RACE.

Manchester, July 7, 1823.

ARISTIPPUS.

OF THE RELIGION OF DEISM COMPARED WITH
THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, AND THE SU-
PERIORITY OF THE FORMER OVER THE
LATTER.

EVERY person of whatever religious denomination he may be is a Deist in the first article of his creed. Deism from the Latin word Deus, God, is the belief of a God, and this belief is the first article of every man's creed.

It is on this article, universally consented to by all mankind, that the Deist builds his church and here he rests. Whenever we step aside from this article, by mixing it with articles of human invention, we wander into a labyrinth of uncertainty and fable, and become exposed to every kind of imposition by pretenders to revelation. The Persian shews the *Zendavista* of Zoroaster the law-giver of Persia, and calls it the *divine law*; the Bremin shews the *shaster*, revealed, he says, by God to Bruma, and given to him out of a cloud; the Jew shews what he calls the law of Moses, given, he says, by God on the Mount Sinai; the Christian shews a collection of books and epistles written by nobody knows who, and called the New Testament, and the Mahometan shews the Koran, given, he says, by God to Mahomet; each of these calls itself *revealed religion*, and the *only* true word of God, and this the followers of each profess to believe from the habit of education, and each believes the others are imposed upon.

But when the divine gift of reason begins to expand itself in the mind and calls man to reflection, he then reads and contemplates God in his works, and not in books pretending to revelation. The creation is the Bible of a true believer in God. Every thing in this vast volume inspires him with sublime ideas of the Creator. The little and paltry, and often obscene tales of the Bible sink into wretchedness when put in comparison with this mighty work. The Deist needs none of those tricks and shows called miracles to confirm his faith, for what can be a greater miracle than the creation itself and his own existence.

There is a happiness in Deism, when rightly understood, that is not to be found in any other system of religion. All other systems have something in them that either shock our reason or are repugnant to it, and man, if he thinks at all,

must stifle his reason in order to force himself to believe them. But in Deism our reason and our belief become happily united. The wonderful structure of the universe and every thing we behold in the system of creation prove to us, far better than books can do, the existence of a God, and at the same time proclaim his attributes. It is by the exercise of our reason that we are enabled to contemplate God in his works and imitate him in his ways. When we see his care and goodness extended over all his creatures, it teaches us our duty towards each other, while it calls forth our gratitude to him. It is by forgetting God in his works, and running after books of pretended revelation that man has wandered from the straight path of duty and happiness, and become by turns the victim of doubt and the dupe of delusion.

Except in the first article in the Christian creed, that of believing in God, there is not an article in it but fills the mind with doubt as to the truth of it the instant man begins to think. Now every article in a creed that is necessary to the happiness and salvation of man ought to be as evident to the reason and comprehension of man as the first article is, for God has not given us reason for the purpose of confounding us, but that we should use it for our own happiness and his glory.

The truth of the first article is proved by God himself and is universal, for *the creation is of itself demonstration of the existence of a Creator*. But the second article, that of God's begetting a son, is not proved in like manner, and stands on no other authority than that of tale. Certain books in what is called the New Testament tell us that Joseph dreamed an angel told him so. (Matthew chap. i, ver. 20) "And behold the angel of the Lord appeared unto Joseph in a dream, saying, Joseph thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." The evidence upon this article bears no comparison with the evidence upon the first article, and therefore is not entitled to the same credit, and ought not to be made an article in a creed, because the evidence of it is defective, and what evidence there is, is doubtful and suspicious. We do not believe the first article on the authority of books, whether called Bibles or Korans, nor yet on the visionary authority of dreams, but on the authority of God's own visible works in the creation. The nations who never heard of such books, nor of such people as Jews, Christians, or Mahometans, believe the existence of a God as fully as

we do, because it is self evident. The work of man's hands is a proof of the existence of man as fully as his personal appearance would be. When we see a watch we have as positive evidence of the existence of a watchmaker as if we saw him; and in like manner the creation is evidence to our reason and our senses of the existence of a Creator. But there is nothing in the works of God that is evidence that he begat a son, nor any thing in the system of creation that corroborates such an idea, and therefore we are not authorised in believing it. What truth there may be in the story that Mary, before she was married to Joseph, was kept by one of the Roman soldiers, and was with child by him, I leave to be settled between the Jews and the Christians. The story however has probability on its side, for her husband Joseph suspected and was jealous of her, and was going to put her away. "Joseph her husband being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was going to put her away privately." (Matthew chap. i, ver. 19).

I have already said, that "whenever we step aside from the first article (that of believing in God) we wander into a labyrinth of uncertainty," and here is evidence of the justness of the remark, for it is impossible for us to decide who was Jesus Christ's father. But presumption can assume any thing, and therefore it makes Joseph's dream to be of equal authority with the existence of God, and to help it on it calls it revelation. It is impossible for the mind of man in its serious moments, however it may have been entangled by education, or beset by priestcraft, not to stand still and doubt upon the truth of this article and of its creed. But this is not all.

The second article of the Christian creed having brought the son of Mary into the world (and this Mary according to the chronological tables was a girl of only fifteen years of age when this son was born) the next article goes on to account for his being begotten, which was, that when he grew a man he should be put to death to expiate, they say, the sin that Adam brought into the world by eating an apple, or some kind of forbidden fruit.

But though this is the creed of the Church of Rome, from whence the Protestants borrowed it, it is a creed which that church has manufactured of itself, for it is not contained in, nor derived from, the book called the New Testament. The four books called the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, which give, or pretend to give, the birth, sayings, life, preaching, and death of Jesus Christ, make no

mention of what is called the fall of man, nor is the name of Adam to be found in any of those books, which it certainly would be if the writers of them believed that Jesus was begotten, born, and died for the purpose of redeeming mankind from the sin which Adam had brought into the world. Jesus never speaks of Adam himself, of the Garden of Eden, nor of what is called the fall of man. Neither did the early Christians believe the story of the fall of man to be fact, but held it to be allegory. The person called St. Augustine, says in his *City of God*, that the adventure of Eve and the serpent, and the account of Paradise, were generally considered in his time as allegory, and he treats them as such himself without attempting to give any explanation of them, but thinks a better might be given than had been offered.

Origen, another of the ancient fathers of the Church, treats the account of the creation in Genesis, and the story of the Garden of Eden and the fall of man, as fable or fiction.

What man of good sense, says he, can ever persuade himself that there was a first, a second, and a third day, and that each of those days had a night, when there was yet neither sun, moon, nor stars! (N. B. According to the account in Genesis, chap. i, the sun and moon was not made until the fourth day)—What man, continues he can be stupid enough to believe that God acting the part of a gardener had planted a garden in the east; that the tree of life was a real tree, and that the fruit of it had the virtue of making those who eat of it live for ever.

The Jews did not believe the first chapters of Genesis to be fact. Muimonides, one of the most learned and celebrated of the Jewish authors who lived in the eleventh century, says, in his book *MORE NEBACHIM*. We ought not to understand nor take according to the letter that which is written in the book of the creation, (the book of Genesis.) Taken, says he, according to the letter, especially with respect to the work of four days, it gives the most absurd and extravagant ideas of God.

But the Church of Rome having set up its new religion which it called Christianity, and invented the creed which is named the Apostles creed, in which it calls Jesus the *only son of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary*, things of which it is impossible that man or woman can have any idea, and consequently no belief but in words, and for which there is no authority but the idle story of Joseph's dream in the first chapter of Matthew, which any designing impostor or foolish fanatic might make,

it then manufactured the allegories in the book of Genesis into fact, and the allegorical tree of life and tree of knowledge into real trees, contrary to the belief of the first Christians, and for which there is not the least authority in any of the books of the New Testament, for in none of them is there any mention made of such place as the Garden of Eden, nor of any thing that is said to have happened there.

But the Church of Rome could not erect the person called Jesus into a Saviour of the world without making the allegories in the book of Genesis into fact, though the New Testament, as before observed, gives no authority for it. All at once the allegorical tree of knowledge became, according to the church, a real tree, the fruit of it real fruit, and the eating of it sinful. As priestcraft was always the enemy of knowledge, because priestcraft supports itself by keeping people in delusion and ignorance, it was consistent with its policy to make the acquisition of knowledge a real sin.

The Church of Rome having done this, it then brings forward Jesus the son of Mary as suffering death to redeem mankind from sin, which Adam, it says, had brought into the world by eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge. But as it is impossible for reason to believe such a story because it can see no reason for it, nor have any evidence of it, the church then tells us we must not regard our reason, but must *believe*, as it were, and that through thick and thin, as if God had given man reason like a play-thing, or a rattle, on purpose to make fun of him. Reason is the forbidden tree of priestcraft, and may serve to explain the allegory of the forbidden tree of knowledge, for we may reasonably suppose the allegory had some meaning and application at the time it was invented. It was the practice of the eastern nations to convey their meaning by allegory, and relate it in the manner of fact. Jesus followed the same method, yet nobody ever supposed the allegory or parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the Prodigal Son, the ten Virgins, &c. were facts. Why then should the tree of knowledge, which is far more romantic in idea than the parable in the New Testament are, be supposed to be a real tree*. The answer to this is, because the church could not make its new fangled system, which it called Christianity, hold together without it. To have made Christ to die on account of an allegorical tree, would have been too bare-faced a fable.

* The remark of Emperor Julian, on the story of the Tree of Knowledge is worth observing. "If," said he, "there ever had been, or could be, a Tree of Knowledge, instead of God forbidding man to eat thereof, it would be that of which he would order him to eat the most."

But the account, as it is given of Jesus in the New Testament, even visionary as it is, does not support the creed of the church that he died for the redemption of the world. According to that account he was crucified and buried on the Friday and rose again in good health on the Sunday morning, for we do not hear that he was sick. This cannot be called dying, and is rather making fun of death than suffering it. There are thousands of men and women also, who, if they could know they should come back again in good health in about thirty-six hours, would prefer such kind of death for the sake of the experiment, and to know what the other side of the grave was. Why then should that which would be only a voyage of curious amusement to us be magnified into merit and sufferings in him? If a God he could not suffer death, for immortality cannot die, and as a man his death could be no more than the death of any other person.

The belief of the redemption of Jesus Christ is altogether an invention of the Church of Rome and not the doctrine of the New Testament. What the writers of the New Testament attempt to prove by the story of Jesus is, the *resurrection of the same body from the grave*, which was the belief of the Pharisees, in opposition to the Sadducees (a sect of Jews) who denied it. Paul, who was brought up a Pharisee, labours hard at this point, for it was the creed of his own Pharisaical church. The xv. chap. i of Corinthians is full of supposed cases and assertions about the resurrection of the same body, but there is not a word in it about redemption. This chapter makes part of the funeral service of the Episcopal church. The dogma of the redemption is the fable of priestcraft invented since the time the New Testament was compiled, and the agreeable delusion of it suited with the depravity of immoral livers. When men are taught to ascribe all their crimes and vices to the temptations of the devil, and to believe that Jesus, by his death, rubs all off and pays their passage to heaven gratis, they become as careless in morals as a spendthrift would be of money, were he told that his father had engaged to pay off all his scores. It is a doctrine, not only dangerous to morals in this world, but to our happiness in the next world, because it holds out such a cheap, easy, and lazy way of getting to heaven as has a tendency to induce men to hug the delusion of it to their own injury.

But there are times when men have serious thoughts, and it is at such times when they begin to think, that they begin to doubt the truth of the Christian Religion, and well they

may, for it is too fanciful and too full of conjecture, inconsistency, improbability, and irrationality, to afford consolation to the thoughtful man. His reason revolts against his creed. He sees that none of its articles are proved, or can be proved. He may believe that such a person as is called Jesus (for Christ was not his name) was born and grew to be a man, because it is no more than a natural and probable case. But who is to prove he is the son of God, that he was begotten by the Holy Ghost? Of these things there can be no proof, and that which admits not of proof, and is against the laws of probability and the order of nature, which God himself has established, is not an object for belief. God has not given man reason to embarrass him, but to prevent his being imposed upon.

He may believe that Jesus was crucified, because many others were crucified, but who is to prove he was crucified *for the sins of the world*? This article has no evidence not even in the New Testament; and if it had, where is the proof that the New Testament, in relating things neither probable nor proveable, is to be believed as true? When an article in a creed does not admit of truth nor of probability the salvo is to call it revelation; but this is only putting one difficulty in the place of another, for it is as impossible to prove a thing to be revelation as it is to prove that Mary was gotten with child by the Holy Ghost.

Here it is that the religion of Deism is superior to the Christian religion. It is free from all those invented and torturing articles that shock our reason or injure our humanity, and with which the Christian religion abounds. Its creed is pure and sublimely simple. It believes in God and there it rests. It honours reason as the choicest gift of God to man, and the faculty by which he is enabled to contemplate the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Creator displayed in the creation; and reposing itself on his protection, both here and hereafter, it avoids all presumptuous beliefs, and rejects, as the fabulous inventions of men, all books pretending to revelation.

THOMAS PAINE.